

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

RIJAN S. SNYDERS,

Petitioner,

v.

NANCY GIROUX, et al.,

Respondents.

CIVIL ACTION  
NO. 15-0521

**ORDER**

**AND NOW**, this 21st day of June 2016, upon consideration of the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Richard A. Lloret (Doc. No. 21), and there being no objections filed to the Report and Recommendation,<sup>1</sup> it is **ORDERED** that:

1. The Report and Recommendation (Doc. No. 21) is **APPROVED** and **ADOPTED**.
2. The Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus (Doc. No. 1) is **DENIED**.
3. Any outstanding motions are **DENIED AS MOOT**.
4. A Certificate of Appealability **SHALL NOT** issue because, based on the analysis contained in the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, as approved and adopted by this Court, a reasonable jurist could not conclude that the Court is incorrect in denying and dismissing the Habeas Petition. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473 (2000).

---

<sup>1</sup> Local Rule of Civil Procedure 5.1(b) states, "Any party who appears pro se shall file with the party's appearance or with the party's initial pleading, an address where notices and papers can be served. Said party shall notify the Clerk within fourteen (14) days of any change of address." Petitioner is pro se. Copies of the Report and Recommendation and Order dated May 27, 2016 were returned as undeliverable because Petitioner has been paroled. Petitioner has not notified the Court of his new address as is required under Local Rule 5.1.

5. The Clerk of Court shall close this case for statistical purposes.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Joel H. Slomsky  
JOEL H. SLOMSKY, J.